

Appl. No. 09/735,088
Amdt. dated December 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated October 1, 2004, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-5, 9-20, 28-32, 35-37, 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Wool* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,948); 2) rejected claims 6, 8, 21, 34, 38, 43, 56, 60 and 63-69 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* and *Levin* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,272,152); 3) rejected claims 7, 22, 27, 28 and 42 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of *Schneier* (no specific reference provided); 4) rejected claims 23, 24, 40, 41 and 46 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of *Menezes* (Handbook of Applied Cryptography, 1997); 5) rejected claim 25, 44 and 54 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of "that which is commonly known in the art"; 6) rejected claims 26 and 45 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of *Schneier*, further in view of "that which is commonly known in the art"; 7) rejected claims 33, 57-59, 61 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of *Denning* (Cryptography and Data Security, 1982), and 8) rejected claims 55 and 62 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wool* in view of *Denning* (Cryptography and Data Security, 1979).

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1-14, 16-48, 50-53, 55-60, and 66-69, and canceled claim 15. Applicants have also amended the specification to reflect the serial numbers and filing dates of the related applications. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe all remaining claims to be in condition for allowance.

I. THE ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 as being anticipated by *Wool*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since *Wool* fails to teach or suggest every claim element. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites "a key repository process executing on said server ... [that] prevents access to said data by said application program if said application program is not authorized" (emphasis added). *Wool* fails to teach or suggest a process running on a server that prevents access to data. *Wool* instead teaches "transferring encrypted

Appl. No. 09/735,088
Amdt. dated December 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

multimedia information ... using a ... server ... to one or more customers having set-top terminals ... over one or more distribution networks," wherein "a set-top terminal includes any mechanism to restrict access to the transmitted multimedia information" Col. 4, lines 42-50 (emphasis added). Claim 1 further recites "a key repository process ... [that] stores and retrieves authorization information," a limitation not taught or suggested by *Wool*. *Wool* instead teaches, "the set-top terminal intermittently receives entitlement information from the head-end server, which permits customers to access programs" Col. 4, lines 61-64 (emphasis added). At least for these reasons, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-12 are allowable over *Wool*. Additionally, various amendments have been made to some of the claims dependent on claim 1 to maintain consistency with the language of claim 1.

The Examiner also rejected claims 13 and 14 as being anticipated by *Wool*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since *Wool* fails to teach or suggest every claim element. Claim 13, as amended, recites the use of the master key of claim 1, wherein "said master key is used to decrypt a public key ... used to encrypt said data." Such a limitation is neither taught nor suggested by *Wool*. Similarly, dependent claim 14, as amended, recites the use of "a second master key ... used to decrypt the public key" of claim 13. Such a limitation is also not taught or suggested by *Wool*. For at least these reasons, as well as the reasons cited with regard to claim 1 upon which claims 13 and 14 depend, claims 13 and 14 are allowable over *Wool*.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 as also being anticipated by *Wool*. Applicants respectfully also traverse this rejection since *Wool* fails to teach or suggest every claim element. As amended, claim 16 recites "a key repository process executing on said server ... wherein if said application process is authorized to access said enterprise credentials, then said key repository process transmits said enterprise credentials to said application process." For reasons similar to those noted with regard to claim 1, *Wool* fails to teach or suggest a key repository process executing on a server that transmits enterprise credentials to an application process if the application process is authorized. Claim 16 also

Appl. No. 09/735,088
Amdt. dated December 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

recites a key repository process that "maintains ... the identity of those application processes authorized to access said enterprise credentials," a limitation not taught nor suggested by *Wool*. For at least these reasons, claim 16 and dependent claims 17-31 are allowable over *Wool*. Further, various amendments have been made to some of the claims dependent on claim 16 to maintain consistency with the language of claim 16.

The Examiner further rejected claim 32 as being anticipated by *Wool*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as well, since *Wool* fails to teach or suggest every claim element. Claim 32, as amended, recites "querying said key repository process by an application programs for access to said data." *Wool* neither teaches nor suggests querying a key repository process for access to data. Claim 32 further recites, "if said application program is authorized to access said data, then transmitting said data to said application program." For reasons similar to those already noted with regard to claim 16, *Wool* fails to teach or suggest transmitting data to an application program if the application program is authorized. At least for these reasons, claim 32 and dependent claims 33-69 are allowable over *Wool*. Also, various amendments have been made to some of the claims dependent on claim 32 to maintain consistency with the language of claim 32.

II. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Applicants note that with regard to several of the § 103 rejections, the Examiner referenced Schneier, but the Office action does not include a specific citation to Schneier, nor was a copy of the Schneier reference included with the Office action. Applicants assume that the intended reference is *Applied Cryptography*, by Bruce Schneier, second edition, 1996. Applicants respectfully request clarification with regard to this reference.

III. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as

Appl. No. 09/735,088
Amdt. dated December 27, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400